

June 2007

DFUB 07

Version 1

---

# The Hitchin Model, Poisson-quasi-Nijenhuis Geometry and Symmetry Reduction

by

**Roberto Zucchini***Dipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi di Bologna**V. Irnerio 46, I-40126 Bologna, Italy**I.N.F.N., sezione di Bologna, Italy**E-mail: zucchini@bo.infn.it*


---

## Abstract

We revisit our earlier work on the AKSZ formulation of topological sigma model on generalized complex manifolds, or Hitchin model, [20]. We show that the target space geometry implied by the BV master equations is Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry recently introduced and studied by Stiénon and Xu (in the untwisted case) in [41]. Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry is more general than generalized complex geometry and comprises it as a particular case. Next, we show how gauging and reduction can be implemented in the Hitchin model. We find that the geometry resulting from the BV master equation is closely related to but more general than that recently described by Lin and Tolman in [37, 38], suggesting a natural framework for the study of reduction of Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis manifolds.

Keywords: quantum field theory in curved spacetime; geometry, differential geometry and topology. PACS: 04.62.+v 02.40.-k

# 1 Introduction

In type II superstring theory, an effective four dimensional low energy field theory is obtained by compactification of the six extra dimensions. In the absence of fluxes, requiring unbroken four dimensional  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetry leads to the well known condition that the six dimensional internal manifold should be Calabi–Yau. In recent years, a large body of literature has been devoted to attempts to find a similarly elegant condition in the presence of NS and RR fluxes, both for  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  and  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetry. (See for instance [1] for a comprehensive review and extensive referencing). The intense scrutiny, which these more general compactifications have undergone, reflects both their physical and mathematical interest.

In flux compactifications of type II superstring theories, requiring unbroken four dimensional  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetry leads to certain topological and differential conditions on the internal manifold  $M$  [2–4]. These conditions are naturally expressed in the mathematical language of generalized complex geometry [5, 6]. (See [7–9] for recent reviews of this subject aimed to a physical readership). They state the existence of two nowhere vanishing globally defined  $TM \oplus T^*M$  pure spinors. One of these satisfies the appropriate differential condition required for it to define a twisted generalized Calabi–Yau structure on  $M$ . The other, conversely does not, the obstruction being due to the presence of RR fluxes and warping.

Ordinary fluxless type II compactifications are described by  $(2, 2)$  superconformal sigma models on Calabi–Yau manifolds. These are however nonlinear interacting field theories and, so, are rather complicated and difficult to study. In 1988, Witten showed that a  $(2, 2)$  supersymmetric sigma model on a Calabi–Yau manifold could be twisted in two different ways, to yield the so called  $A$  and  $B$  topological sigma models [10, 11]. Unlike the original untwisted sigma models, the topological models are soluble field theories: the calculation of observables can be carried out by standard methods of geometry and topology.

The recent interest in flux compactifications has prompted the search for topological sigma models on generalized complex manifolds. In the particular case of biHermitian manifolds [12], this problem was tackled in [13,14] by Kapustin and Kapustin and Li, who formulated it in the suitable geometrical framework of generalized Kaehler geometry [6] and derived the appropriate twisting prescriptions. In refs. [15–17], developing on Kapustin’s and Li’s results, the biHermitian topological action and symmetry variations were explicitly derived and written down.

BiHermitian geometry can accommodate only NS flux. If one wishes to incorporate RR fluxes, it is non longer sufficient. In the last few years, many attempts have been made to construct topological sigma models with generalized complex target manifolds more general than generalized Kaehler ones [18–22]. All these endeavors were somehow unsatisfactory either because they remained confined to the analysis of geometrical aspects of the sigma models or because they yielded field theories which were not directly suitable for quantization. In [20–22], the sigma models were constructed by employing the Batalin–Vilkovisky (BV) quantization algorithm [23,24] in the Alexandrov–Kontsevich–Schwartz–Zaboronsky (AKSZ) formulation [25]. To date, this seems to be the most promising approach to the solution of the problem of constructing interesting sigma models on generalized complex target manifolds, though, as shown in [26], the implementation of gauge fixing remains a major technical obstacle even in the simplest cases.

One efficient way of generating sigma models on non trivial manifolds is the gauging of sigma models on simpler manifolds. The target space of the gauged model turns out to be the quotient of that of the ungauged model by an action of the gauge group. In certain cases, when a symplectic structure and a moment map for the gauge group action can be defined, this construction is a particular case of a general procedure called Hamiltonian reduction [27]. The gauging of (2,2) supersymmetric sigma models on biHermitian manifolds was studied originally by Hull, Papadopoulos and Spence in [28] developing on the results of [12].

Their analysis was however limited to the subclass of almost product structure biHermitian spaces because of the lack of an off-shell (2,2) supersymmetric action in the general case at that time. Recently, such action has been obtained in ref. [29]. This has led the authors of [30] to extend the analysis of [28] for general biHermitian target spaces. In [31], the same analysis has been carried out in the on-shell formalism. Simultaneously, many mathematical studies of the problem of reduction of generalized complex, Calabi–Yau and Kaehler manifolds have appeared [32–40], calling for a comparison with the target space geometries yielded by sigma model gauging.

In this paper, we revisit our earlier work on the AKSZ formulation of topological sigma model on generalized complex manifolds, or Hitchin model, which we introduced in 2004 in [20]. We show that the target space geometry encoded in the BV master equations is twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry recently introduced and studied by Stiénon and Xu (in the untwisted case) in [41]. Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry is more general than generalized complex geometry and comprises it as a particular case. This should clarify the issue of the underlying geometry of the Hitchin model raised but not solved in [20]. Next, we show how gauging (here meant in a non standard way explained in the following) can be incorporated in the Hitchin model. We find that the geometry resulting from the BV master equation is closely related to but more general than that described by Lin and Tolman in [37,38] and is fully  $b$  symmetry covariant, suggesting a natural framework for the study of reduction of twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis manifolds.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In sect. 2, we review the basic features of the AKSZ formulation of topological sigma models relevant in the following. In sect. 3, we introduce the Weil sigma model, a canonical sigma model associated to any real Lie algebra, and study it in the AKSZ framework. In sect. 4, we review the AKSZ formulation of the Poisson sigma model and gauge it by coupling it to the Weil model. This introduces sect. 5, where we revisit the AKSZ formulation

of the Hitchin sigma model showing that the underlying geometry is twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis and gauge it by coupling it again to the Weil model. In sect. 6, we study the geometry of the Hitchin–Weil model and show substantial evidence that this may encode a rather general reduction scheme for Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry. Finally, in sect. 7, we discuss the results obtained.

## 2 The AKSZ paradigm

The Alexandrov–Kontsevich–Schwartz–Zaboronsky (AKSZ) formalism of ref. [25] is a method of constructing solutions of the Batalin–Vilkovisky (BV) classical master equation directly, without starting from a classical action with a set of symmetries, as is usually done in the BV framework [23, 24]. In ref. [42, 43], using such formalism, Cattaneo and Felder managed to obtain the BV action of the Poisson sigma model [44, 45]. In spirit, their approach is essentially the same as the one of the present paper. For this reason, we shall review it briefly. We refer the reader to app. A for a review of de Rham superfield formalism used throughout this paper.

Following [43], we view the standard Poisson sigma model as a field theory whose base space, target space and field configuration space are respectively a two dimensional surface  $\Sigma$ , a Poisson manifold  $M$  with Poisson 2–vector  $P$  and the space  $\mathcal{F}$  of maps  $\phi : T[1]\Sigma \mapsto T^*[1]M$ .

The supermanifold  $T^*[1]M$  has a canonical odd symplectic structure, or  $P$ –structure, defined by the canonical odd symplectic form  $\omega = du_a dt^a$ . With  $\omega$ , there are associated canonical odd Poisson brackets  $(\ , \ )_\omega$  in standard fashion. Indeed, the algebra of functions on  $T^*[1]M$  with the odd brackets  $(\ , \ )_\omega$  is isomorphic to the algebra of multivector fields on  $M$  with the standard Schoutens–Nijenhuis brackets. The field space  $\mathcal{F}$  inherits an odd symplectic structure from that of  $T^*[1]M$  and, so, it also carries a  $P$ –structure. The associated odd symplectic form  $\Omega$  is obtained from  $\omega$  by integration over  $T[1]\Sigma$  with respect to the usual supermeasure  $\varrho$  (cf. (A.5)). With  $\Omega$ , there are associated odd Poisson brackets

$(\ , \ )_\Omega$  over the algebra of functions on the field configuration space  $\mathcal{F}$ , called BV antibrackets in the physical literature.

The base space  $T[1]\Sigma$  has a canonical nilpotent odd vector field, or  $Q$ -structure, defined by the usual de Rham differential  $d$  on  $\Sigma$ .  $d$  induces a  $Q$ -structure, also denoted by  $d$ , on the field configuration space  $\mathcal{F}$  in obvious fashion.  $d$  is Hamiltonian, as indeed  $d = \delta_1 = (S_1, \ )_\Omega$  for a certain function  $S_1$  on  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $S_1$  satisfies the BV master equation  $(S_1, S_1)_\Omega = 0$ .

The Poisson 2-vector field  $P$  of  $M$  can be identified with a function on  $T^*[1]M$  satisfying  $(P, P)_\omega = 0$ . Its Hamiltonian vector field  $Q_P = (P, \ )_\omega$  defines a  $Q$  structure on  $T^*[1]M$ . The Poisson 2-vector  $P$  yields a function  $S_2$  on  $\mathcal{F}$ , again by integration over  $T[1]\Sigma$  with respect to  $\varrho$ , satisfying BV master equation  $(S_2, S_2)_\Omega = 0$ . Its Hamiltonian vector field  $\delta_2 = (S_2, \ )_\Omega$  yields in this way a  $Q$ -structure on the field configuration space  $\mathcal{F}$ .

One verifies that  $(S_1, S_2)_\Omega = 0$ . The sum  $S_t = S_1 + S_2$  thus satisfies the BV master equation  $(S_t, S_t)_\Omega = 0$ .  $S_t$  is the BV action of the Poisson sigma model. Its Hamiltonian vector field  $\delta_t = (S_t, \ )_\Omega$  is the BV variation operator.

In this paper, we consider sigma models whose base space, target space and field configuration space are respectively a two dimensional surface  $\Sigma$ , a supermanifold  $X$  carrying various types of algebraic or geometrical structures and a space  $\mathcal{F}$  of maps  $\phi : T[1]\Sigma \mapsto X$ . A BV odd symplectic form  $\Omega$  is defined on  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $\delta\Omega = 0$ , where  $\delta$  denotes the de Rham differential in  $\mathcal{F}$ <sup>1</sup>. This allows to define BV antibrackets  $(\ , \ )$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  in the usual way.

The sigma models are characterized by a pair of action functionals  $S_r$ ,  $r = 1, 2$ , which satisfy the joined BV master equation

$$(S_r, S_s) = 0, \quad r, s = 1, 2. \quad (2.1)$$

With the  $S_r$  there are associated odd BV variations by

$$\delta_r \phi = (S_r, \phi), \quad (2.2)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> The  $\delta$  should not be confused with the BV operators  $\delta_r$  introduced below.

where  $\phi$  is any field of  $\mathcal{F}$ . When (2.1) holds, one has

$$\delta_r \delta_s + \delta_s \delta_r = 0, \quad r, s = 1, 2. \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover, one has

$$\delta_r S_s = 0, \quad r, s = 1, 2. \quad (2.4)$$

The general action of the model is of the form

$$S_t = t_1 S_1 + t_2 S_2, \quad (2.5)$$

where  $t \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$  is a parameter<sup>2</sup>. It satisfies the BV master equation

$$(S_t, S_t) = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

The associated BV variation is

$$\delta_t = t_1 \delta_1 + t_2 \delta_2. \quad (2.7)$$

$\delta_t$  is nilpotent,

$$\delta_t^2 = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Further, one has

$$\delta_t S_t = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

We do not consider models with actions functionals differing by an overall factor as distinct. So, one actually has a  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  worth of inequivalent models.

For a given field theory of the type described above, the choice of the action functionals  $S_r$ ,  $r = 1, 2$ , is non unique. One is allowed to carry out a linear redefinition of the form

$$S'_r = \sum_{s=1}^2 A_{rs} S_s, \quad (2.10)$$

---

<sup>2</sup> In certain cases, it may be natural to take  $t$  to be real. Everything stated below works also under this restriction.

where  $(A_{rs})_{r,s=1,2}$  is a non singular 2 by 2 complex matrix. For each sigma model considered in this paper, it is possible to choose  $S_1$  in such a way that for any field  $\phi$ , one has

$$\delta_1 \phi = d\phi. \quad (2.11)$$

Upon doing this,  $S_2$  is defined up to the addition of a complex multiple of  $S_1$ .

The similarity of the constructions of this paper with the AKSZ formulation of the Poisson sigma model of [42, 43] should be manifest now. For this reason we call the above theoretical frame work the AKSZ paradigm.

### 3 The Weil sigma model

In this section, we introduce the Weil sigma model, which plays an important role in the following. The Weil model is a canonical sigma model associated to any real Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . As it will turn out, coupling to the Weil model implements the gauging of the symmetry associated with the connected Lie group  $G$  having  $\mathfrak{g}$  as its Lie algebra.

The field content of the model consists of fields  $\beta \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, \mathfrak{g}^\vee[0])$ ,  $\gamma \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, \mathfrak{g}[1])$ ,  $B \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, \mathfrak{g}^\vee[-1])$  and  $\Gamma \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, \mathfrak{g}[2])$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is for the time being a real vector space. The BV odd symplectic form is

$$\Omega_W = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \delta\beta_i \delta\gamma^i + \delta B_i \delta\Gamma^i \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

This satisfies obviously

$$\delta\Omega_W = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

The associated BV rackets are

$$(F, G)_W = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta\beta_i} \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta\gamma^i} - \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta\gamma^i} \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta\beta_i} + \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta B_i} \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta\Gamma^i} - \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta\Gamma^i} \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta B_i} \right], \quad (3.3)$$

for any two functionals  $F, G$  on field space.



The model is characterized by two basic action functionals given by

$$S_{W1} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \beta_i d\gamma^i - B_i d\Gamma^i \right], \quad (3.4a)$$

$$S_{W2} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \beta_i \Gamma^i - \frac{1}{2} f^i_{jk} \beta_i \gamma^j \gamma^k - f^i_{jk} B_i \Gamma^j \gamma^k \right], \quad (3.4b)$$

where  $f \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}^\vee$ . A simple computation yields the BV brackets

$$(S_{W1}, S_{W1})_W = 0, \quad (3.5a)$$

$$(S_{W1}, S_{W2})_W = 0, \quad (3.5b)$$

$$(S_{W2}, S_{W2})_W = 2 \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \frac{1}{6} g^i_{jkl} \beta_i \gamma^j \gamma^k \gamma^l + \frac{1}{2} g^i_{jkl} B_i \Gamma^j \gamma^k \gamma^l \right], \quad (3.5c)$$

where  $g \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \wedge^3 \mathfrak{g}^\vee$  is given by

$$g^i_{jkl} = f^i_{mj} f^m_{kl} + f^i_{mk} f^m_{lj} + f^i_{ml} f^m_{jk}. \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, the joined BV master equations

$$(S_{Wr}, S_{Ws})_W = 0, \quad r, s = 1, 2, \quad (3.7)$$

are satisfied if and only if

$$g^i_{jkl} = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

that is when  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a Lie algebra with structure constants  $f^i_{jk}$ . In this way, when (3.8) is fulfilled, we are in the AKSZ paradigm described in sect. 2.

The BV variations associated with the actions  $S_{Wr}$  are defined according to (2.2) as  $\delta_{Wr} = (S_{Wr}, \cdot)_W$ . Explicitly,

$$\delta_{W1} \beta_i = d\beta_i, \quad (3.9a)$$

$$\delta_{W1} \gamma^i = d\gamma^i, \quad (3.9b)$$

$$\delta_{W1} B_i = dB_i, \quad (3.9c)$$

$$\delta_{W1}\Gamma^i = d\Gamma^i, \quad (3.9d)$$

$$\delta_{W2}\beta_i = -f^j{}_{ik}\beta_j\gamma^k - f^j{}_{ik}B_j\Gamma^k, \quad (3.9e)$$

$$\delta_{W2}\gamma^i = \Gamma^i - \frac{1}{2}f^i{}_{jk}\gamma^j\gamma^k, \quad (3.9f)$$

$$\delta_{W2}B_i = -\beta_i + f^j{}_{ik}B_j\gamma^k, \quad (3.9g)$$

$$\delta_{W2}\Gamma^i = -f^i{}_{jk}\gamma^j\Gamma^k. \quad (3.9h)$$

To any Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ , there is canonically associated the Weil algebra  $W(\mathfrak{g}) = \wedge^*\mathfrak{g}^\vee[1] \otimes \vee^*\mathfrak{g}^\vee[2]$ . This is the tensor product of the antisymmetric and symmetric algebras of  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$  in degree 1 and 2, respectively. The natural  $\mathfrak{g}$ -valued generators  $\omega, \Omega$  of  $W(\mathfrak{g})$  carry degrees 1, 2, respectively. The Weil operator  $d_W$  acts as

$$d_W\omega^i = \Omega^i - \frac{1}{2}f^i{}_{jk}\omega^j\omega^k, \quad (3.10a)$$

$$d_W\Omega^i = -f^i{}_{jk}\omega^j\Omega^k, \quad (3.10b)$$

and is extended on  $W(\mathfrak{g})$  by linearity.  $d_W$  is nilpotent

$$d_W^2 = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

The cohomology of  $(W(\mathfrak{g}), d_W)$  is actually trivial<sup>3</sup>. It appears that the fields  $\gamma, \Gamma$  describe the embedding of  $T[1]\Sigma$  into the Weil algebra. Further, by (3.9f), (3.9h), for any point  $z \in T[1]\Sigma$ , the evaluation map  $e_z : C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, W(\mathfrak{g})) \mapsto W(\mathfrak{g})$  is a chain map of the chain complexes  $(C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, W(\mathfrak{g})), \delta_{W2})$ ,  $(W(\mathfrak{g}), d_W)$ . This justifies the name given to the sigma model considered above.

The Weil sigma model describes a supersymmetric gauge ghost system. The algebraic structure presented here is closely related to those appearing in the so called topological field theories of cohomological type. (See sect 10.3 of ref. [46])

---

<sup>3</sup> As is well known, it is possible to define also a  $\mathfrak{g}$  basic cohomology of  $(W(\mathfrak{g}), d_W)$ , which turns out to be non trivial.

for a thorough review of these matters with many illustrative examples).

## 4 The Poisson–Weil sigma model

In this section, we illustrate the Poisson–Weil sigma model. This is interesting on its own and serves also the purpose of introducing the treatment of the more complicated Hitchin–Weil model expounded later. Our presentation is closely related to that of ref. [20], in turn inspired by refs. [42, 43].

The field content of the Poisson sigma model consists of a degree 0 embedding  $x \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, M)$  and a degree 1 section  $y \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, x^*T^*[1]M)$ . The BV odd symplectic form is

$$\Omega_M = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \delta x^a \delta y_a. \quad (4.1)$$

This satisfies obviously

$$\delta \Omega_M = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

The associated BV antibrackets are given by

$$(F, G)_M = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta x^a} \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta y_a} - \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta y_a} \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta x^a} \right], \quad (4.3)$$

for any two functionals  $F, G$  on field space. See app. B for technical details.

The model is characterized by two action functionals

$$S_{P1} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho y_a dx^a, \quad (4.4a)$$

$$S_{P2} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \frac{1}{2} P^{ab}(x) y_a y_b, \quad (4.4b)$$

where  $P \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 TM)$  is a 2–vector defining an almost Poisson structure on  $M$ .

A simple computation yields the BV brackets

$$(S_{P1}, S_{P1})_M = 0, \quad (4.5a)$$

$$(S_{P1}, S_{P2})_M = 0, \quad (4.5b)$$

$$(S_{P2}, S_{P2})_M = 2 \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ -\frac{1}{6} A^{abc}(x) y_a y_b y_c \right], \quad (4.5c)$$

where the 3-vector  $A \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 TM)$  is given by

$$A^{abc} = P^{ad}\partial_d P^{bc} + P^{bd}\partial_d P^{ca} + P^{cd}\partial_d P^{ab}. \quad (4.6)$$

Therefore, the joined BV master equations

$$(S_{Pr}, S_{Ps})_M = 0, \quad r, s = 1, 2, \quad (4.7)$$

are satisfied if and only if

$$A^{abc} = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

In this way, when (4.8) holds, we are in the AKSZ paradigm described in sect. 2. As is well-known, condition (4.8) ensures the almost Poisson structure  $P$  is actually a Poisson structure, so that  $M$  is a Poisson manifold.

The BV variations associated with the actions  $S_{Pr}$  are defined according to (2.2) as  $\delta_{Pr} = (S_{Pr}, \cdot)_M$ . Explicitly, one has

$$\delta_{P1}x^a = dx^a, \quad (4.9a)$$

$$\delta_{P1}y_a = dy_a, \quad (4.9b)$$

$$\delta_{P2}x^a = P^{ab}(x)y_b, \quad (4.9c)$$

$$\delta_{P2}y_a = \frac{1}{2}\partial_a P^{bc}(x)y_b y_c. \quad (4.9d)$$

One can couple the Poisson and the Weil sigma models to obtain the Poisson–Weil sigma model. The field space of Poisson–Weil model is simply the Cartesian product of those of the Poisson and Weil models. The BV odd symplectic form  $\Omega_{MW}$  of the Poisson–Weil model is correspondingly the sum of those of the Poisson and Weil models,  $\Omega_{MW} = \Omega_M + \Omega_W$ . Consequently, the BV antibrackets  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{MW}$  are the sum of the BV antibrackets  $(\cdot, \cdot)_M$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_W$  given by (4.3), (3.3).

The Poisson–Weil model is characterized by two action functionals:

$$S_{PW1} = S_{P1} + S_{W1}, \quad (4.10a)$$

$$S_{PW2} = S_{P2} + S_{W2} + \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ -u_i{}^a(x) \gamma^i y_a + \mu_i(x) \Gamma^i \right], \quad (4.10b)$$

where  $u \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes TM)$  and  $\mu \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee)$  are a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued vector field and a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued scalar on  $M$ , respectively.

A straightforward computation yields the BV brackets

$$(S_{PW1}, S_{PW1})_{MW} = 0, \quad (4.11a)$$

$$(S_{PW1}, S_{PW2})_{MW} = 0, \quad (4.11b)$$

$$(S_{PW2}, S_{PW2})_{MW} = (S_{P2}, S_{P2})_M + (S_{W2}, S_{W2})_W \quad (4.11c)$$

$$+ 2 \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \frac{1}{2} X_i^{ab}(x) \gamma^i y_a y_b - \frac{1}{2} L_{ij}^a(x) \gamma^i \gamma^j y_a + N_{ij}(x) \gamma^i \Gamma^j - S_i^a(x) \Gamma^i y_a \right],$$

where the BV antibrackets  $(S_{P2}, S_{P2})_M$ ,  $(S_{W2}, S_{W2})_W$  are given by (4.5c), (3.5c), respectively, and  $X \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes \wedge^2 TM)$ ,  $L \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes TM)$ ,  $N \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\vee)$ ,  $S \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes TM)$  are given by

$$X_i^{ab} = u_i^c \partial_c P^{ab} - \partial_c u_i^a P^{cb} - \partial_c u_i^b P^{ac}, \quad (4.12a)$$

$$L_{ij}^a = u_i^b \partial_b u_j^a - u_j^b \partial_b u_i^a - f^k_{ij} u_k^a, \quad (4.12b)$$

$$N_{ij} = u_i^b \partial_b \mu_j - f^k_{ij} \mu_k, \quad (4.12c)$$

$$S_i^a = u_i^a + P^{ab} \partial_b \mu_i. \quad (4.12d)$$

The joined BV master equations

$$(S_{PW_r}, S_{PW_s})_{MW} = 0, \quad r, s = 1, 2, \quad (4.13)$$

are satisfied if and only if (4.8), the conditions

$$N_{ij} = 0, \quad (4.14a)$$

$$S_i^a = 0, \quad (4.14b)$$

and (3.8) are simultaneously fulfilled. Indeed, it is easy to see that, when  $u_i$  is given by (4.14b), one has

$$X_i^{ab} = A^{abc} \partial_c \mu_i, \quad (4.15a)$$

$$L_{ij}^a = A^{abc} \partial_b \mu_i \partial_c \mu_j - P^{ab} \partial_b N_{ij}, \quad (4.15b)$$

In this way, when (4.8), (4.14) and (3.8) hold, we are again in the AKSZ paradigm described in sect. 2. The geometry of  $M$  emerging here will be analyzed in greater detail in sect. 6. We anticipate that that  $M$  is a Poisson manifold carrying an infinitesimal action of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  leaving the Poisson structure  $P$  invariant, the action being Hamiltonian with equivariant moment map  $\mu$ . This geometrical set up allows for the symmetry reduction of  $M$ , which is therefore encoded in the Poisson–Weil model.

The BV variations associated with the actions  $S_{PW_r}$  are defined as usual according to (2.2) as  $\delta_{PW_r} = (S_{PW_r}, \cdot)_{MW}$ . Explicitly, one has

$$\delta_{PW_1} x^a = \delta_{P_1} x^a, \quad (4.16a)$$

$$\delta_{PW_1} y_a = \delta_{P_1} y_a, \quad (4.16b)$$

$$\delta_{PW_1} \beta_i = \delta_{W_1} \beta_i, \quad (4.16c)$$

$$\delta_{PW_1} \gamma^i = \delta_{W_1} \gamma^i, \quad (4.16d)$$

$$\delta_{PW_1} B_i = \delta_{W_1} B_i, \quad (4.16e)$$

$$\delta_{PW_1} \Gamma^i = \delta_{W_1} \Gamma^i, \quad (4.16f)$$

$$\delta_{PW_2} x^a = \delta_{P_2} x^a + u_i^a(x) \gamma^i, \quad (4.16g)$$

$$\delta_{PW_2} y_a = \delta_{P_2} y_a - \partial_a u_i^b(x) \gamma^i y_b + \partial_a \mu_i(x) \Gamma^i, \quad (4.16h)$$

$$\delta_{PW_2} \beta_i = \delta_{W_2} \beta_i - u_i^a(x) y_a, \quad (4.16i)$$

$$\delta_{PW_2} \gamma^i = \delta_{W_2} \gamma^i, \quad (4.16j)$$

$$\delta_{PW_2} B_i = \delta_{W_2} B_i - \mu_i(x), \quad (4.16k)$$

$$\delta_{PW_2} \Gamma^i = \delta_{W_2} \Gamma^i, \quad (4.16l)$$

where the variations  $\delta_{P_r}$ ,  $\delta_{W_r}$  are given in (4.9), (3.9), respectively.

## 5 The Hitchin–Weil sigma model

In this section, we illustrate the Hitchin–Weil sigma model, which is the main topic of this paper. We follow closely the AKSZ treatment of ref. [20]. This will lead us on one hand to realize that the underlying geometry of the model is

Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis rather than generalized complex, on the other it will give us useful indications about symmetry reduction in this context, to be discussed in detail in sect. 6.

The target space of the Hitchin sigma model is a twisted manifold, i. e. a manifold  $M$  equipped with a closed 3–form  $H \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 T^*M)$ ,<sup>4</sup>

$$\partial_a H_{bcd} - \partial_b H_{acd} + \partial_c H_{abd} - \partial_d H_{abc} = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

The field content of the Hitchin sigma model consists of a degree 0 embedding  $x \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, M)$  and a degree 1 section  $y \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, x^* T^*[1]M)$  as for the Poisson sigma model. The BV odd symplectic form is

$$\Omega_{M,H} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \delta x^a \delta y_a - \frac{1}{2} H_{abc}(x) \delta x^a dx^b \delta x^c \right]. \quad (5.2)$$

It is easy to check that  $\Omega_{M,H}$  satisfies

$$\delta \Omega_{M,H} = 0 \quad (5.3)$$

on account of (5.1). The associated BV antibrackets are given by

$$(F, G)_{M,H} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta x^a} \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta y_a} - \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta y_a} \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta x^a} + H_{abc}(x) \frac{\delta_r F}{\delta y_a} dx^b \frac{\delta_l G}{\delta y_c} \right], \quad (5.4)$$

for any two functionals  $F, G$  on field space. See again app. B for technical details.

The model is characterized by two action functionals

$$S_{H1} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho y_a dx^a + 2 \int_{\Gamma} x^{(0)*} H, \quad (5.5a)$$

$$S_{H2} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \frac{1}{2} P^{ab}(x) y_a y_b + J^a{}_b(x) y_a dx^b \right] + \int_{\Gamma} x^{(0)*} \Phi. \quad (5.5b)$$

Here,  $\Gamma$  is a 3–fold such that  $\partial\Gamma = \Sigma$  and  $x^{(0)} : \Gamma \rightarrow M$  is an embedding such that  $x^{(0)}|_{\Sigma}$  equals the lowest degree 0 component of the embedding superfield  $x$  (see app. A) and whose choice is immaterial.  $P \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 TM)$ ,

---

<sup>4</sup> The sign convention of the  $H$  field used here is opposite to that employed in ref. [20].

$J \in C^\infty(M, \text{End } TM)$ ,  $\Phi \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 T^*M)$ , are respectively a 2-vector, an endomorphism and a closed 3-form

$$\partial_a \Phi_{bcd} - \partial_b \Phi_{acd} + \partial_c \Phi_{abd} - \partial_d \Phi_{abc} = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

Further, the compatibility condition

$$J^a{}_c P^{cb} + J^b{}_c P^{ca} = 0 \quad (5.7)$$

holds. The tensors  $P$ ,  $J$  and  $\Phi$  together define an almost Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure [41]. The version of the Hitchin model presented here is more general than that originally expounded in [20], where the 3-form  $\Phi$  was assumed to be exact (cf. eq. (5.12) below).

A straightforward computation yields the BV brackets

$$(S_{H1}, S_{H1})_{M,H} = 0, \quad (5.8a)$$

$$(S_{H1}, S_{H2})_{M,H} = 0, \quad (5.8b)$$

$$(S_{H2}, S_{H2})_{M,H} = 2 \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ -\frac{1}{6} A_H^{abc}(x) y_a y_b y_c + \frac{1}{2} B_H^{ab}{}_c(x) y_a y_b dx^c - \frac{1}{2} C_H^a{}_{bc}(x) y_a dx^b dx^c \right], \quad (5.8c)$$

where the tensor  $A_H \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 TM)$ ,  $B_H \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 TM \otimes T^*M)$ ,  $C_H \in C^\infty(M, TM \otimes \wedge^2 T^*M)$  are given by

$$A_H^{abc} = P^{ad} \partial_d P^{bc} + P^{bd} \partial_d P^{ca} + P^{cd} \partial_d P^{ab}, \quad (5.9a)$$

$$B_H^{ab}{}_c = J^d{}_c \partial_d P^{ab} + P^{ad} (\partial_c J^b{}_d - \partial_d J^b{}_c) - P^{bd} (\partial_c J^a{}_d - \partial_d J^a{}_c) - \partial_c (J^a{}_d P^{db}) - P^{ad} P^{be} H_{cde}, \quad (5.9b)$$

$$C_H^a{}_{bc} = J^d{}_b \partial_d J^a{}_c - J^d{}_c \partial_d J^a{}_b - J^a{}_d \partial_b J^d{}_c + J^a{}_d \partial_c J^d{}_b + P^{ad} \Phi_{dbc} + J^d{}_b P^{ae} H_{cde} - J^d{}_c P^{ae} H_{bde}. \quad (5.9c)$$

Therefore, the joined BV master equations

$$(S_{Hr}, S_{Hs})_{M,H} = 0, \quad r, s = 1, 2, \quad (5.10)$$



are satisfied if and only if

$$A_H^{abc} = 0, \quad (5.11a)$$

$$B_H^{ab}{}_c = 0, \quad (5.11b)$$

$$C_H^a{}_{bc} = 0. \quad (5.11c)$$

In this way, when (5.11) holds, we are in the AKSZ paradigm described in sect. 2. Conditions (5.11) are satisfied when the almost Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure  $(P, J, \Phi)$  is an  $H$ –twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure. A more restrictive notion of Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis manifold was introduced by Stiénon and Xu in [41] in the untwisted case  $H = 0$  (see sect. 6 below). As appears, the target space geometry of the Hitchin model encoded in the BV master equations is twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis. This broadens the scope of our original work on this model [20]. (See also [47, 48] for an alternative approach).

Twisted generalized complex geometry is a special case of twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry. For a generalized almost complex manifold, the 3–form  $\Phi$  is exact, so that one has

$$\Phi_{abc} = \partial_a Q_{bc} + \partial_b Q_{ca} + \partial_c Q_{ab}, \quad (5.12)$$

for some  $Q \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 T^*M)$ . The compatibility conditions are (5.7) and

$$J^a{}_c J^c{}_b + P^{ac} Q_{cb} + \delta^a{}_b = 0, \quad (5.13a)$$

$$Q_{ac} J^c{}_b + Q_{bc} J^c{}_a = 0. \quad (5.13b)$$

The differential conditions (5.11) are necessary but not sufficient for the target space generalized almost complex structure to be Courant integrable. To have Courant integrability, one needs, besides (5.11), a further condition

$$D_{Habc} = 0 \quad (5.14)$$

where  $D_H \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 T^*M)$  is a 3–form defined by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{Habc} = & J^d{}_a \Phi_{dbc} + J^d{}_b \Phi_{dca} + J^d{}_c \Phi_{dab} - \partial_a(Q_{bd} J^d{}_c) - \partial_b(Q_{cd} J^d{}_a) \\ & - \partial_c(Q_{ad} J^d{}_b) + H_{abc} - J^d{}_a J^e{}_b H_{cde} - J^d{}_b J^e{}_c H_{ade} - J^d{}_c J^e{}_a H_{bde}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

The Courant integrability conditions (5.11), (5.14) were first derived in [18] and in equivalent form in [20] before Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry was formulated in [41].

The BV variations associated with the actions  $S_{Hr}$  are defined according to (2.2) as  $\delta_{Hr} = (S_{Hr}, \cdot)_{M,H}$ . Explicitly, one has

$$\delta_{H1}x^a = dx^a, \quad (5.16a)$$

$$\delta_{H1}y_a = dy_a, \quad (5.16b)$$

$$\delta_{H2}x^a = P^{ab}(x)y_b + J^a{}_b(x)dx^b, \quad (5.16c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{H2}y_a = & \frac{1}{2}\partial_a P^{bc}(x)y_b y_c + (\partial_a J^b{}_c - \partial_c J^b{}_a - P^{bd}H_{dac})(x)y_b dx^c \\ & + J^b{}_a(x)dy_b + \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{abc} - J^d{}_c H_{abd} + J^d{}_b H_{acd})(x)dx^b dx^c \end{aligned} \quad (5.16d)$$

One can couple the Hitchin and the Weil sigma models and obtain the Hitchin–Weil sigma model, as one did for the Poisson sigma model. The field space of Hitchin–Weil model is simply the Cartesian product of those of the Hitchin and Weil models. The BV odd symplectic form  $\Omega_{MW,H}$  of the Hitchin–Weil model is correspondingly the sum of those of the Hitchin and Weil models,  $\Omega_{MW,H} = \Omega_{M,H} + \Omega_W$ . The BV antibrackets  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{MW,H}$  are simply the sum of the BV antibrackets  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{M,H}$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_W$  given by (5.4), (3.3).

The Hitchin–Weil model is characterized by two action functionals,

$$S_{HW1} = S_{H1} + S_{W1}, \quad (5.17a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{HW2} = S_{H2} + S_{W2} + \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \Big[ & i\beta_i d\gamma^i - iB_i d\Gamma^i - u_i{}^a(x)\gamma^i y_a \\ & - (\tau_{ia} - i\partial_a \mu_i)(x)\gamma^i dx^a + \mu_i(x)\Gamma^i \Big], \end{aligned} \quad (5.17b)$$

where  $u \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes TM)$ ,  $\tau \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes T^*M)$  and  $\mu \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee)$  are a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued vector field, a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued 1-form and a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued scalar on  $M$ , respectively. We note that the action  $S_{HW2}$  is intrinsically complex because of the factors  $i$  appearing in the third term.

The computation of the BV brackets of the  $S_{HWr}$  is lengthy but completely straightforward. The result is

$$(S_{HW1}, S_{HW1})_{MW,H} = 0, \quad (5.18a)$$

$$(S_{HW1}, S_{HW2})_{MW,H} = 0, \quad (5.18b)$$

$$(S_{HW2}, S_{HW2})_{MW,H} = (S_{H2}, S_{H2})_M + (S_{W2}, S_{W2})_W \quad (5.18c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + 2 \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \left[ \frac{1}{2} X_i^{ab}(x) \gamma^i y_a y_b + Y_i^a{}_b(x) \gamma^i y_a dx^b + \frac{1}{2} Z_{iab}(x) \gamma^i dx^a dx^b \right. \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} L_{ij}^a(x) \gamma^i \gamma^j y_a - \frac{1}{2} M_{ija}(x) \gamma^i \gamma^j dx^a + N_{ij}(x) \gamma^i \Gamma^j \\ & \quad \left. - R_{ij}(x) \gamma^i d\gamma^j - S_i^a(x) \Gamma^i y_a - T_{ia}(x) \Gamma^i dx^a + V_i^a(x) d\gamma^i y_a \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the BV antibrackets  $(S_{H2}, S_{H2})_M$ ,  $(S_{W2}, S_{W2})_W$  are given by (5.8c), (3.5c), respectively, and  $X \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes \wedge^2 TM)$ ,  $Y \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes \text{End } TM)$ ,  $Z \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes \wedge^2 T^*M)$ ,  $L \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes TM)$ ,  $M \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes T^*M)$ ,  $N, R \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\vee)$ ,  $S, V \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes TM)$ ,  $T \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes T^*M)$  are given by

$$X_i^{ab} = u_i^c \partial_c P^{ab} - \partial_c u_i^a P^{cb} - \partial_c u_i^b P^{ac}, \quad (5.19a)$$

$$Y_i^a{}_b = u_i^c \partial_c J^a{}_b - \partial_c u_i^a J^c{}_b + \partial_b u_i^c J^a{}_c - P^{ac} \Upsilon_{icb}, \quad (5.19b)$$

$$Z_{iab} = u_i^c \Phi_{cab} - \partial_a \Xi_{ib} + \partial_b \Xi_{ia} + J^c{}_a \Upsilon_{icb} - J^c{}_b \Upsilon_{ica}, \quad (5.19c)$$

$$L_{ij}^a = u_i^b \partial_b u_j^a - u_j^b \partial_b u_i^a - f^k{}_{ij} u_k^a, \quad (5.19d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ija} = \frac{1}{2} & \left[ u_i^b \partial_b \tau_{ja} + \partial_a u_i^b \tau_{jb} - u_j^b \partial_b \tau_{ia} - \partial_a u_j^b \tau_{ib} - 2f^k{}_{ij} \tau_{ka} \right. \\ & \left. - u_j^b \Upsilon_{iba} + u_i^b \Upsilon_{jba} - i \partial_a (u_i^b \partial_b \mu_j - u_j^b \partial_b \mu_i - 2f^k{}_{ij} \mu_k) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.19e)$$

$$N_{ij} = u_i^a \partial_a \mu_j - f^k{}_{ij} \mu_k, \quad (5.19f)$$

$$R_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ u_i^a \tau_{ja} + u_j^a \tau_{ia} - i(u_i^a \partial_a \mu_j + u_j^a \partial_a \mu_i) \right], \quad (5.19g)$$

$$S_i^a = u_i^a + P^{ab} \partial_b \mu_i, \quad (5.19h)$$

$$T_{ia} = \tau_{ia} - J^b{}_a \partial_b \mu_i, \quad (5.19i)$$

$$V_i^a = J^a{}_b u_i^b + P^{ab} (\tau_{ib} - i \partial_b \mu_i) - i u_i^a, \quad (5.19j)$$

where  $\Xi \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes T^*M)$ ,  $\Upsilon \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes \wedge^2 T^*M)$  are given by

$$\Xi_{ia} = i(\delta^b_a - iJ^b_a)(\tau_{ib} - i\partial_b\mu_i), \quad (5.19k)$$

$$\Upsilon_{iab} = \partial_a\tau_{ib} - \partial_b\tau_{ia} - u_i^c H_{cab}. \quad (5.19l)$$

The joined BV master equations

$$(S_{HWr}, S_{HWs})_{MW,H} = 0, \quad r, s = 1, 2, \quad (5.20)$$

are satisfied if and only if (5.11), the conditions

$$N_{ij} = 0, \quad (5.21a)$$

$$S_i^a = 0, \quad (5.21b)$$

$$T_{ia} = 0, \quad (5.21c)$$

and (3.8) are simultaneously fulfilled. Indeed, it is not difficult to check that, when  $u_i$  and  $\tau_i$  are given by (5.21b) and (5.21c), respectively, one has

$$X_i^{ab} = A_H^{cab} \partial_c \mu_i, \quad (5.22a)$$

$$Y_i^a{}_b = -B_H^{ca}{}_b \partial_c \mu_i, \quad (5.22b)$$

$$Z_{iab} = C_H^c{}_{ab} \partial_c \mu_i \quad (5.22c)$$

$$L_{ij}^a = A_H^{abc} \partial_b \mu_i \partial_c \mu_j - P^{ab} \partial_b N_{ij}, \quad (5.22d)$$

$$M_{ija} = -B_H^{bc}{}_a \partial_b \mu_i \partial_c \mu_j - i(\delta^b_a + iJ^b_a) \partial_b N_{ij}, \quad (5.22e)$$

$$R_{ij} = 0, \quad (5.22f)$$

$$V_i^a = 0. \quad (5.22g)$$

In this way, when (5.11), (5.21) and (3.8) hold, we are again in the AKSZ paradigm described in sect. 2. The geometrical interpretation of conditions (5.21) will be analyzed later in sect. 6. We anticipate that the geometry they describe is closely related to but more general than that of reduction of generalized complex and Kaehler manifolds under a group action recently developed by

Lin and Tolman in [37, 37] and may suggest a viable framework for reduction of Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis manifolds.

In the formulation of refs. [37, 37], generalized complex geometry being concerned, (5.12)–(5.14) hold true. In addition to (5.11), (5.21) and (3.8), it is further assumed that

$$\Upsilon_{ia} = 0, \quad (5.23)$$

where  $\Upsilon$  is given by (5.19l). All the tensors appearing in (5.22) continue of course to vanish, but one also has a further relation, which pairs with (5.22g),

$$W_{ia} = 0, \quad (5.24)$$

where  $W \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes T^*M)$  is given by

$$W_{ia} = Q_{ab}u_i^b - J^b{}_a(\tau_{ib} - i\partial_b\mu_i) - i(\tau_{ia} - i\partial_a\mu_i). \quad (5.25)$$

These conditions plus other regularity conditions are sufficient to ensure the existence of a reduction of the relevant generalized complex manifold.

The BV variations associated with the actions  $S_{HWr}$  are defined as usual according to (2.2) as  $\delta_{HWr} = (S_{HWr}, \cdot)_{MW,H}$ . Explicitly,

$$\delta_{HW1}x^a = \delta_{H1}x^a, \quad (5.26a)$$

$$\delta_{HW1}y_a = \delta_{H1}y_a, \quad (5.26b)$$

$$\delta_{HW1}\beta_i = \delta_{W1}\beta_i, \quad (5.26c)$$

$$\delta_{HW1}\gamma^i = \delta_{W1}\gamma^i, \quad (5.26d)$$

$$\delta_{HW1}B_i = \delta_{W1}B_i, \quad (5.26e)$$

$$\delta_{HW1}\Gamma^i = \delta_{W1}\Gamma^i, \quad (5.26f)$$

$$\delta_{HW2}x^a = \delta_{H2}x^a + u_i^a(x)\gamma^i, \quad (5.26g)$$

$$\delta_{HW2}y_a = \delta_{H2}y_a - \partial_a u_i^b(x)\gamma^i y_b - (\tau_{ia} - i\partial_a\mu_i)(x)d\gamma^i \quad (5.26h)$$

$$- (\partial_a\tau_{ib} - \partial_b\tau_{ia} - u_i^c H_{cab})(x)\gamma^i dx^b + \partial_a\mu_i(x)\Gamma^i,$$

$$\delta_{HW2}\beta_i = \delta_{W2}\beta_i + id\beta_i - u_i^a(x)y_a - (\tau_{ia} - i\partial_a\mu_i)(x)dx^a, \quad (5.26i)$$

$$\delta_{HW2}\gamma^i = \delta_{W2}\gamma^i + id\gamma^i, \quad (5.26j)$$

$$\delta_{HW2}B_i = \delta_{W2}B_i + idB_i - \mu_i(x), \quad (5.26k)$$

$$\delta_{HW2}\Gamma^i = \delta_{W2}\Gamma^i + id\Gamma^i, \quad (5.26l)$$

where the variations  $\delta_{Hr}$ ,  $\delta_{Wr}$  are given in (5.16), (3.9), respectively.

$b$  transformation is the basic symmetry of generalized complex geometry. Though originally discovered in this context,  $b$  transformation can be straightforwardly generalized to twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry. For a thorough analysis of the significance of  $b$  transformation, the reader is referred to [6].

$b$  transformation is parameterized by a 2-form  $b \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 T^*M)$ . It acts in the 3-form  $H$  by shifting it by  $d_M b$ :

$$H'_{abc} = H_{abc} + \partial_a b_{bc} + \partial_b b_{ca} + \partial_c b_{ab}. \quad (5.27)$$

It acts also on the tensors  $P$ ,  $J$  and  $\Phi$  defining an almost Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure by setting

$$P'^{ab} = P^{ab}, \quad (5.28a)$$

$$J'^a{}_b = J^a{}_b - P^{ac}b_{cb}, \quad (5.28b)$$

$$\Phi'_{abc} = \Phi_{abc} + \partial_a \phi_{bc} + \partial_b \phi_{ca} + \partial_c \phi_{ab}, \quad (5.28c)$$

where  $\phi_{ab}$  is given by

$$\phi_{ab} = b_{ac}J^c{}_b - b_{bc}J^c{}_a + P^{cd}b_{ca}b_{db}. \quad (5.28d)$$

It is immediate to see that the BV odd symplectic form  $\Omega_{M,H}$  given in (5.2) is not invariant under  $b$  transformation [20]. To render it invariant, it is necessary to make  $b$  transformation act also on the sigma model fields as

$$x'^a = x^a, \quad (5.29a)$$

$$y'_a = y_a + b_{ab}(x)dx^b. \quad (5.29b)$$

One then has

$$\Omega'_{M,H} = \Omega_{M,H}, \quad (5.30)$$

as required. It is straightforward to verify that the Hitchin action functionals  $S_{Hr}$  are also both invariant under  $b$  transformation,

$$S'_{Hr} = S_{Hr}, \quad r = 1, 2. \quad (5.31)$$

This shows that  $b$  transformation is a duality symmetry of the Hitchin model [20].

$b$  transformation can be rendered a symmetry of the Hitchin–Weil model if we stipulate further that the tensors  $u_i$ ,  $\tau_i$  and  $\mu_i$  transform as

$$u'^a_i = u^a_i, \quad (5.32a)$$

$$\tau'_{ia} = \tau_{ia} + b_{ab}u^b_i, \quad (5.32b)$$

$$\mu'_i = \mu_i. \quad (5.32c)$$

Upon doing this, it is readily seen that the Hitchin–Weil action functionals  $S_{HWr}$  are also both invariant under  $b$  transformation,

$$S'_{HWr} = S_{HWr}, \quad r = 1, 2. \quad (5.33)$$

As we shall see,  $b$  symmetry plays an important role also in the analysis of reduction given in the next section.

## 6 Geometrical interpretation

Let  $M$  be a manifold. An almost Poisson structure on  $M$  is an element  $P \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 TM)$ . An almost Poisson structure  $P$  is a Poisson structure if

$$[P, P] = 0, \quad (6.1)$$

where  $[\ , \ ]$  denotes the Schoutens–Nijenhuis brackets. (More explicitly,  $[P, P] \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 TM)$  is given by the right hand side of (6.8a) below). (6.1) is nothing but (4.8) expressed in coordinate free form. As is well known, when a Poisson

structure  $P$  on  $M$  is given, one can define Poisson brackets on  $C^\infty(M)$  in standard fashion.

Assume now that the our Poisson manifold  $(M, P)$  carries the action of a connected Lie group  $G$  with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  represented infinitesimally by the  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued vector field  $u \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes TM)$ . The action is said Hamiltonian, if there exist a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued scalar  $\mu \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee)$ , called the moment map, such that <sup>5</sup>

$$u_i = -Pd_M\mu_i, \quad (6.2a)$$

$$l_{u_i}\mu_j = f^k_{ij}\mu_k. \quad (6.2b)$$

These are precisely conditions (4.14) written in intrinsic notation. When (6.1), (6.2) hold, one has

$$l_{u_i}P = 0, \quad (6.3a)$$

$$l_{u_i}u_j - f^k_{ij}u_k = 0, \quad (6.3b)$$

so that  $P$  is invariant and the  $u$  is equivariant. These are relations (4.15) upon taking (4.8), (4.14) into account written again in intrinsic notation.

A classic result of Marsden and Ratiu [49] (see also [50]) ensures that, under these conditions, if  $a \in \mathfrak{g}^\vee$  with coadjoint orbit  $\mathcal{O}_a$  and  $\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_a)$  is a submanifold of  $M$  on which  $G$  acts freely and properly, then the quotient  $M_a = \mu^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_a)/G$  inherits a Poisson structure  $P_a$ . Thus, the Poisson–Weil model described in sect. 4 encodes Poisson reduction.

Next, we want to analyze the extent to which the above standard Poisson reduction framework extends to Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structures. To the best of our knowledge, no such reduction scheme has been developed so far. However, since, as shown above, Poisson reduction is encoded in the Poisson–Weil model, it is reasonable to expect that Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis reduction may be encoded in the Hitchin–Weil model expounded in sect. 5.

---

<sup>5</sup> Here and below, we view  $P$  equivalently as a section of  $\text{Hom}(T^*M, TM)$ .



Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structures were first introduced by Sti  non and Xu in [41], who, in turn, were inspired by earlier work by Magri e Morosi [51]. The authors of [41] considered only the untwisted case, but their analysis can be extended to the twisted case directly.

A manifold  $M$  is called twisted if it is equipped with a closed 3–form  $H \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 T^*M)$

$$d_M H = 0. \quad (6.4)$$

Henceforth, we assume that  $M$  is twisted.

An almost Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure on  $M$  is a triple  $(J, P, \Phi)$ , where  $P \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 TM)$ ,  $J \in C^\infty(M, \text{End } TM)$ ,  $\Phi \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 T^*M)$  with

$$d_M \Phi = 0, \quad (6.5)$$

(cf. eq. (5.6)) and satisfying the compatibility condition

$$JP - PJ^t = 0 \quad (6.6)$$

(cf. eq. (5.7)). An almost Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure  $(J, P, \Phi)$  on  $M$  is an  $H$  twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure if

$$A_H = 0, \quad (6.7a)$$

$$B_H = 0, \quad (6.7b)$$

$$C_H = 0, \quad (6.7c)$$

where the tensor  $A_H \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^3 TM)$ ,  $B_H \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 TM \otimes T^*M)$ ,  $C_H \in C^\infty(M, TM \otimes \wedge^2 T^*M)$  are defined by

$$A_H(\alpha, \beta) = [P\alpha, P\beta] - P\{\alpha, \beta\}_P, \quad (6.8a)$$

$$B_H(\alpha, \beta) = \{\alpha, J^t\beta\}_P - \{\beta, J^t\alpha\}_P - \{\alpha, \beta\}_{PJ^t} - J^t\{\alpha, \beta\}_P + i_{P\alpha}i_{P\beta}H, \quad (6.8b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_H(X, Y) = & [JX, JY] - J([JX, Y] - [JY, X] - J[X, Y]) \\ & - P(i_X i_Y \Phi - i_{JX} i_Y H + i_{JY} i_X H), \end{aligned} \quad (6.8c)$$

where  $\alpha, \beta \in C^\infty(M, T^*M)$  and  $X, Y \in C^\infty(M, TM)$ ,

$$\{\alpha, \beta\}_K = l_{K\alpha}\beta - l_{K\beta}\alpha - \frac{1}{2}d_M(i_{K\alpha}\beta - i_{K\beta}\alpha), \quad (6.8d)$$

for  $K \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 TM)$ , and  $l$  and  $i$  denote Lie derivation and contraction, respectively. It is straightforward to check that the local coordinate expressions of  $A_H, B_H, C_H$  are precisely those given by eq. (5.9), justifying the claim previously made about the underlying geometry of the Hitchin model.

In [41], a further condition is added (in the  $H = 0$  case). The 3-form  $\Phi$  is required to satisfy the condition

$$d_J\Phi = 0, \quad (H = 0), \quad (6.9)$$

where  $d_J = [J^t \wedge, d]$ . To understand the reason of this condition, we recall the following result proven in [41]. The conditions (6.7) together are equivalent to: 1)  $(T^*M, \{\cdot, \cdot\}, P)$  being a Lie algebroid; 2)  $d_J$  being a degree 1 derivation of the associated Gerstenhaber algebra  $(C^\infty(M, \wedge^* T^*M), \wedge, [\cdot, \cdot])$ ; 3) the relation  $d_J^2 = [\Phi, \cdot]$ . These three properties together with (6.9) render  $(T^*M, \{\cdot, \cdot\}, P, d_J, \Phi)$  a quasi Lie bialgebroid. Thus, an untwisted Poisson–quasi Nijenhuis structure on  $M$ , in the more restricted sense used here, is tantamount of a quasi Lie bialgebroid structure on  $T^*M$ . The condition (6.9) is added, among other things, because the relation  $d_J^2 = [\Phi, \cdot]$  requires as a consistency condition that  $[d_J\Phi, \cdot] = 0$  and (6.9) is sufficient for this to hold. This indicates that the three conditions (6.7) imply (6.9) or some mild generalization of it. As we have seen, (6.9) does not follow from our BV analysis. The classical BV master equation yields the conditions which the target space geometry must satisfy for the welldefinedness of the model, but of course it does not yield the consistency conditions which these imply.

Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis geometry is covariant not only under diffeomorphism symmetry but also under  $b$  transformation symmetry. For  $b \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 T^*M)$ , the  $b$ -transform of the 3-form  $H$  is

$$H' = H + d_M b, \quad (6.10)$$

(cf. eq. (5.27)). The  $b$  transform of an almost Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure  $(P, J, \Phi)$  is given by

$$P' = P, \quad (6.11a)$$

$$J' = J - Pb, \quad (6.11b)$$

$$\Phi' = \Phi + d_M(J^t \wedge b - bPb), \quad (6.11c)$$

(cf. eq. (5.28)). It is straightforward though lengthy to verify that  $(P, J, \Phi)$  is an  $H$  twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure, then  $(P', J', \Phi')$  is  $H'$  twisted Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure.

Assume now that the our Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis manifold  $(M, P, J, \Phi)$  carries the action of a connected Lie group  $G$  with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Intuitively, since the relevant vector bundle in Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis is  $TM \oplus T^*M$  rather than  $TM$ , as in generalized complex geometry, we expect that the  $G$  action is represented at the infinitesimal level not only by a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued vector field  $u \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes TM)$ , as above, but also by a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued 1-form  $\tau \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes T^*M)$ , which we name moment 1-form in compliance with common usage. We call the  $G$  action Hamiltonian, if there exist a  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ -valued scalar  $\mu \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee)$ , called the moment map, such that

$$u_i = -Pd_M\mu_i, \quad (6.12a)$$

$$\tau_i = J^t d_M\mu_i, \quad (6.12b)$$

$$l_{u_i}\mu_j = f^k_{ij}\mu_k. \quad (6.12c)$$

These are precisely conditions (5.21) written in intrinsic notation. They generalize (6.2) in obvious fashion. When (6.12), (6.7) hold,

$$l_{u_i}P = 0, \quad (6.13a)$$

$$l_{u_i}J - P\Upsilon_i = 0 \quad (6.13b)$$

$$i_{u_i}\Phi - d_M\Xi_i + J^t \wedge \Upsilon_i = 0 \quad (6.13c)$$

$$l_{u_i}u_j - f^k_{ij}u_k = 0, \quad (6.13d)$$

$$l_{u_i}\tau_j - f^k_{ij}\tau_k - i_{u_j}\Upsilon_i = 0, \quad (6.13e)$$

where  $\Xi \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes T^*M)$ ,  $\Upsilon \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes \wedge^2 T^*M)$  are given by

$$\Xi_i = (1 + J^t J^t) d_M \mu_i, \quad (6.13f)$$

$$\Upsilon_i = d_M \tau_i - i_{u_i} H. \quad (6.13g)$$

These are relations (5.22) upon taking (5.11), (5.21) into account written again in intrinsic notation. They generalize (6.3) in a rather non trivial way. We see that  $H$  is not invariant and that, while  $P$  is invariant,  $J$ ,  $\Phi$  fail to be so. Similarly, while  $u$  is equivariant,  $\tau$  is not. In all cases, the obstruction is given by the 2-form  $\Upsilon$ .

In the presence of a  $G$  action on  $M$ , the above geometric framework is covariant under  $b$  transformation provided this acts also on  $u$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\mu$  as

$$u'_i = u_i, \quad (6.14a)$$

$$\tau'_i = \tau_i - i_{u_i} b, \quad (6.14b)$$

$$\mu'_i = \mu_i, \quad (6.14c)$$

(cf. eq. (5.32)). From these relations and from (6.13), one realizes immediately that the failure of  $H$ ,  $J$ ,  $\Phi$  to be invariant and, similarly, of  $\tau$  to be equivariant has the form of an infinitesimal  $b$  transform with  $b = \Upsilon_i$  for given  $i$ . That this comes about is hardly surprising, given the  $b$  symmetry of the Hitchin–Weil model, from which (6.13) were obtained. It reflects also the fact that the symmetry of the geometry considered here is larger than the diffeomorphism one and contains also  $b$  transformation, as in generalized complex geometry. The natural question arises about whether it is possible to make all the  $\Upsilon_i$  vanish by means of a single  $b$  transform. It is easy to see that, to this end, it is sufficient that the  $b$  field solves the equation

$$l_{u_i} b = \Upsilon_i. \quad (6.15)$$

Unfortunately, general conditions under which (6.15) has solutions are not known to us. Alternatively, one may impose the condition

$$\Upsilon_i = 0, \quad (6.16)$$

by hand. This, however, is not yielded by the formalism in natural fashion. It is natural to wonder whether the above provides a viable framework for the reduction of Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structures. We have no answer as yet. It is however useful to that end to examine what is known about reduction in generalized complex geometry.

A generalized almost complex structure  $\mathcal{J}$  is a section of  $C^\infty(\text{End}(TM \oplus T^*M))$ , which is an isometry of the natural Courant metric  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  of  $TM \oplus T^*M$  and satisfies

$$\mathcal{J}^2 = -1 \quad (6.17)$$

[6]. The generalized almost complex structure  $\mathcal{J}$  is called a generalized complex structure if its  $+i$  eigenbundles  $L_{\mathcal{J}}$  of  $\mathcal{J}$  is involutive with respect to the  $H$  twisted Courant brackets  $[\cdot, \cdot]_H$  of  $TM \oplus T^*M$  [6]<sup>6</sup>.

It is often convenient to write a generalized almost complex structure  $\mathcal{J}$  in the block form

$$\mathcal{J} = \begin{pmatrix} J & Q \\ P & -J^t \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.18)$$

where  $P \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 TM)$ ,  $J \in C^\infty(M, \text{End} TM)$ ,  $Q \in C^\infty(M, \wedge^2 T^*M)$ . It is easily checked that the triple  $(P, J, \Phi)$ , where

$$\Phi = d_M Q, \quad (6.19)$$

is an almost Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure satisfying besides (6.6) two more algebraic conditions following from (6.17) and corresponding to eq. (5.13). If

---

<sup>6</sup> The  $\pm i$  eigenbundles of  $\mathcal{J}$  are complex and, thus, their analysis requires complexifying  $TM \oplus T^*M$  leading to  $(TM \oplus T^*M) \otimes \mathbb{C}$ .

$\mathcal{J}$  is a generalized complex structure, then  $(P, J, \Phi)$  is a Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structure satisfying besides (6.7) an extra differential condition following from Courant involutivity of  $L_{\mathcal{J}}$  and corresponding to eq. (5.14).

Assume now that our generalized complex manifold  $(M, \mathcal{J})$  carries the the action of a connected Lie group  $G$  with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  represented infinitesimally by the vector fields  $u_i$ . Following Lin and Tolman [37, 38] (see also [33]), we define a generalized moment map to be an element  $A \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{g}^\vee \otimes (TM \oplus T^*M) \otimes \mathbb{C})$  of the form

$$A_i = u_i + \tau_i - id_M \mu_i \quad (6.20)$$

such that

$$\mathcal{J}A_i = iA_i \quad (6.21)$$

and that (6.12c) holds. It is easy to see that (6.21) implies (6.12a), (6.12b) and summarizes in intrinsic form (5.22g), (5.24).

Let us assume that (6.16) holds. (6.16) is just (5.23). From (6.13a)–(6.13c) and (6.16), it follows that  $H$  and  $P, J, Q$  and, so,  $\mathcal{J}$  are all invariant. Similarly, (6.13e) and (6.16) imply that  $\tau$  is equivariant. According to the authors of [37, 38], under these conditions, if, for  $a \in \mathfrak{g}^\vee$  with coadjoint orbit  $\mathcal{O}_a$  and if  $\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_a)$  is a submanifold of  $M$  on which  $G$  acts freely, then the quotient  $M_a = \mu^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_a)/G$  inherits a generalized complex structure  $\mathcal{J}_a$ .

The above analysis shows that the reduction scheme of Lin and Tolman is a particular case of the one worked out in this paper. It seems therefore to point to a reduction framework far more general than that considered by Lin and Tolman. One one hand, it may apply to Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis structures, which are more general than generalized complex ones. On the other, strict invariance may not be necessary at the end and the weaker conditions (6.13a)–(6.13c) may suffice.

## 7 Discussion

In sects. 4, 5, we have argued that the Poisson–Weil and Hitchin–Weil sigma

models encode the symmetry reduction of the Poisson and Hitchin sigma models, respectively. In a sense, coupling to the Weil model should perform the same type of function as gauging and may be considered to be a gauging in a sense, though, strictly speaking, there is no gauge field that interacts with the ungauged sigma model fields.

The sigma models studied in this paper cannot be considered fully fledged quantum field theories as long as gauge fixing is not carried out, since, in the absence of gauge fixing, the kinetic terms of the fields are ill defined. Fixing the gauge requires restricting the fields on a suitable functional submanifold  $\mathfrak{L}$  in field space, that is Lagrangian with respect to the BV odd symplectic form [23–25]. The restriction results in certain relations among the fields. Formal arguments, based on the BV master equation, indicate that the resulting gauge fixed field theory is independent at the quantum level from the choice of  $\mathfrak{L}$  as long as the choices considered can be continuously deformed one into another. Unfortunately, fixing the gauge is usually a technically very hard problem [25, 26].

We have seen that symmetry reduction of a Poisson or a generalized complex manifold requires the choice of some element  $a \in \mathfrak{g}^\vee$ . The reduced manifold is then the quotient  $M_a = \mu^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_a)/G$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_a$  is the coadjoint orbit of  $a$ . However, there is no trace of such a choice in the models we described. It is likely that  $a$  enters in some way in the definition of the functional Lagrangian submanifold  $\mathfrak{L}$  involved in gauge fixing. However, at the moment, this is only a speculation. Clearly, much work remains to be done to reach a better understanding of these matters.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank J. Louis for organizing the Workshop on "Generalized Geometry and Flux Compactifications" held in DESY from February 19th through March 1st 2007, during which this paper was first conceived. We thank J.-P. Ortega for correspondence and useful suggestions.

## A De Rham superfields

In general, the fields of a 2-dimensional field theory are differential forms on a oriented closed 2-dimensional manifold  $\Sigma$ . They can be viewed as elements of the space  $C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma)$  of functions on the Grassmann degree 1 tangent bundle  $T[1]\Sigma$  of  $\Sigma$ , which we shall call de Rham superfields. More explicitly, we associate with the coordinates  $z^\alpha$  of  $\Sigma$  Grassmann odd partners  $\zeta^\alpha$  with

$$\deg z^\alpha = 0, \quad \deg \zeta^\alpha = 1. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$T[1]\Sigma$  is endowed with a natural differential  $d$  defined by

$$dz^\alpha = \zeta^\alpha, \quad d\zeta^\alpha = 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

A generic de Rham superfield  $\psi(z, \zeta)$  is a triplet formed by a 0-, 1-, 2-form field  $\psi^{(0)}(z)$ ,  $\psi^{(1)}_\alpha(z)$ ,  $\psi^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta}(z)$  organized as

$$\psi(z, \zeta) = \psi^{(0)}(z) + \zeta^\alpha \psi^{(1)}_\alpha(z) + \frac{1}{2} \zeta^\alpha \zeta^\beta \psi^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta}(z). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The forms  $\psi^{(0)}$ ,  $\psi^{(1)}$ ,  $\psi^{(2)}$  are called the components of  $\psi$ . Note that, in this formalism, the exterior differential of  $\Sigma$  can be identified with the operator

$$d = \zeta^\alpha \partial / \partial z^\alpha. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The coordinate invariant integration measure of  $T[1]\Sigma$  is

$$\varrho = dz^1 dz^2 d\zeta^1 d\zeta^2. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Any de Rham superfield  $\psi$  can be integrated on  $T[1]\Sigma$  according to the prescription

$$\int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \psi = \int_\Sigma \frac{1}{2} dz^\alpha dz^\beta \psi^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta}(z). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

By Stokes' theorem,

$$\int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho d\psi = 0. \quad (\text{A.7})$$



It is possible to define functional derivatives of functionals of de Rham superfields. Let  $\psi$  be a de Rham superfield and let  $F(\psi)$  be a functional of  $\psi$ . We define the left/right functional derivative superfields  $\delta_{l,r}F(\psi)/\delta\psi$  as follows. Let  $\sigma$  be a superfield of the same properties as  $\psi$ . Then,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} F(\psi + t\sigma) \right|_{t=0} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \sigma \frac{\delta_l F(\psi)}{\delta\psi} = \int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho \frac{\delta_r F(\psi)}{\delta\psi} \sigma. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

In the applications below, the components of the relevant de Rham superfields carry, besides the form degree, also a ghost degree. We shall limit ourselves to homogeneous superfields. A de Rham superfield  $\psi$  is said homogeneous if the sum of the form and ghost degree is the same for all its components  $\psi^{(0)}$ ,  $\psi^{(1)}$ ,  $\psi^{(2)}$  of  $\psi$ . The common value of that sum is called the (total) degree  $\deg \psi$  of  $\psi$ . It is easy to see that the differential operator  $d$  and the integration operator  $\int_{T[1]\Sigma} \varrho$  carry degree 1 and  $-2$ , respectively. Also, if  $F(\psi)$  is a functional of a superfield  $\psi$ , then  $\deg \delta_{l,r}F(\psi)/\delta\psi = \deg F - \deg \psi + 2$ .

## B The functional derivation $\delta/\delta x^a$

Since, for given  $x \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, M)$ , one has  $y \in C^\infty(T[1]\Sigma, x^*T^*[1]M)$ , it is not possible to vary  $x$  keeping  $y$  fixed. In fact, the condition  $\delta y = 0$  is not covariant, as is easy to see, and, so, it cannot be consistently imposed. This poses a technical problem for the computation of the functional derivatives  $\delta F/\delta x^a$ , when  $F$  explicitly depends on  $y$ . The difficulty is solved by picking a connection  $\Gamma$  of  $M$  and requiring that

$$\delta_{\text{cov}} y_a = \delta y_a - \Gamma^b_{ca}(x) \delta x^c y_b = 0, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

under variation of  $x$ . It is convenient to take  $\Gamma$  torsionless. One then computes  $\delta_{\text{cov}} F/\delta x^a$  by varying both  $x$  and  $y$  with  $\delta y$  given by (B.1). The result depends of course on the choice  $\Gamma$ . However, in all the relevant calculations,  $\Gamma$  drops out at the end, reflecting the intrinsic covariance of the theory.

The BV brackets (4.3), (5.4) are to be computed by replacing  $\delta/\delta x^a$  by  $\delta_{\text{cov}}/\delta x^a$  throughout. It can be checked that the result does not depend on  $\Gamma$ .

Similarly, if  $S_t$  is a BV master action, then the BV variations, obtained from

$$\delta_t x^a = (S_t, x^a), \tag{B.2a}$$

$$\delta_t y_a - \Gamma^b_{ca}(x) \delta_t x^c y_b = (S_t, y_a), \tag{B.2b}$$

also do not depend on  $\Gamma$ .

## References

- [1] M. Grana, “Flux compactifications in string theory: A comprehensive review”, Phys. Rept. **423** (2006) 91, [arXiv:hep-th/0509003].
- [2] M. Grana, R. Minasian, M. Petrini and A. Tomasiello, “Supersymmetric backgrounds from generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds”, JHEP **0408** (2004) 046 [arXiv:hep-th/0406137].
- [3] M. Grana, R. Minasian, M. Petrini and A. Tomasiello, “Generalized structures of  $N = 1$  vacua”, JHEP **0511**, 020 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0505212].
- [4] L. Martucci and P. Smyth, “Supersymmetric D-branes and calibrations on general  $N = 1$  backgrounds”, JHEP **0511** (2005) 048 [arXiv:hep-th/0507099].
- [5] N. Hitchin, “Generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds”, Q. J. Math. **54** (2003), no. 3, 281 [arXiv:math.DG/0209099].
- [6] M. Gualtieri, “Generalized complex geometry”, Oxford University DPhil thesis, arXiv:math.DG/0401221.
- [7] M. Zabzine, “Lectures on generalized complex geometry and supersymmetry”, Archivum Mathematicum (supplement) **42** (2006) 119 [arXiv:hep-th/0605148].
- [8] G. Cavalcanti, “Introduction to generalized complex geometry”, lecture notes, Workshop on Mathematics of String Theory 2006, Australian National University, Canberra, <http://www.maths.ox.ac.uk/~gilrc/australia.pdf>.

- [9] S. Guttenberg, “Brackets, sigma models and integrability of generalized complex structures”, arXiv:hep-th/0609015.
- [10] E. Witten, “Topological sigma models”, Commun. Math. Phys. **118** (1988) 411.
- [11] E. Witten, “Mirror manifolds and topological field theory”, in “Essays on mirror manifolds”, ed. S. T. Yau, International Press, Hong Kong, (1992) 120 [arXiv:hep-th/9112056].
- [12] S. J. Gates, C. M. Hull and M. Roček, “Twisted multiplets and new supersymmetric nonlinear sigma models,” Nucl. Phys. B **248** (1984) 157.
- [13] A. Kapustin, “Topological strings on noncommutative manifolds”, IJGMMP **1** nos. 1 & 2 (2004) 49 [arXiv:hep-th/0310057].
- [14] A. Kapustin and Y. Li, “Topological sigma-models with H-flux and twisted generalized complex manifolds”, arXiv:hep-th/0407249.
- [15] R. Zucchini, “The biHermitian topological sigma model”, JHEP **0612** (2006) 039 [arXiv:hep-th/0608145].
- [16] R. Zucchini, “BiHermitian supersymmetric quantum mechanics”, Class. Quant. Grav. **24** (2007) 2073 [arXiv:hep-th/0611308].
- [17] W. y. Chuang, “Topological twisted sigma model with H-flux revisited” arXiv:hep-th/0608119.
- [18] U. Lindstrom, R. Minasian, A. Tomasiello and M. Zabzine, “Generalized complex manifolds and supersymmetry”, Commun. Math. Phys. **257** (2005) 235 [arXiv:hep-th/0405085].
- [19] U. Lindstrom, “Generalized complex geometry and supersymmetric nonlinear sigma models”, arXiv:hep-th/0409250.

- [20] R. Zucchini, “A sigma model field theoretic realization of Hitchin’s generalized complex geometry”, JHEP **0411** (2004) 045 [arXiv:hep-th/0409181].
- [21] R. Zucchini, “Generalized complex geometry, generalized branes and the Hitchin sigma model”, JHEP **0503** (2005) 022 [arXiv:hep-th/0501062].
- [22] V. Pestun, “Topological strings in generalized complex space”, arXiv:hep-th/0603145.
- [23] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, “Gauge algebra and quantization”, Phys. Lett. B **102** (1981) 27.
- [24] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, “Quantization of gauge theories with linearly dependent generators”, Phys. Rev. D **28** (1983) 2567 (Erratum-ibid. D **30** (1984) 508).
- [25] M. Alexandrov, M. Kontsevich, A. Schwartz and O. Zaboronsky, “The Geometry of the master equation and topological quantum field theory”, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **12** (1997) 1405 [arXiv:hep-th/9502010].
- [26] R. Zucchini, “A topological sigma model of biKaehler geometry”, JHEP **0601** (2006) 041 [arXiv:hep-th/0511144].
- [27] J. Marsden and A. Weinstein, “Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry”, Rep. Math. Phys. **5** (1974) 121.
- [28] C. M. Hull, G. Papadopoulos and B. J. Spence, “Gauge symmetries for  $(p, q)$  supersymmetric sigma models”, Nucl. Phys. B **363** (1991) 593.
- [29] U. Lindstrom, M. Roček, R. von Unge and M. Zabzine, “Generalized Kaehler manifolds and off-shell supersymmetry”, Commun. Math. Phys. **269** (2007) 833 [arXiv:hep-th/0512164].
- [30] W. Merrell, L. A. P. Zayas and D. Vaman, “Gauged  $(2,2)$  sigma models and generalized Kaehler geometry”, arXiv:hep-th/0610116.

- [31] A. Kapustin and A. Tomasiello, “The general (2,2) gauged sigma model with three-form flux”, arXiv:hep-th/0610210.
- [32] H. Bursztyn, G. R. Cavalcanti and M. Gualtieri, “Reduction of Courant algebroids and generalized complex structures”, arXiv:math.DG/0509640.
- [33] S. Hu, “Hamiltonian symmetries and reduction in generalized geometry”, arXiv:math.DG/0509060.
- [34] M. Stiénon and P. Xu, “Reduction of generalized complex structures”, arXiv:math.DG/0509393.
- [35] I. Vaisman, “Reduction and submanifolds of generalized complex manifolds”, arXiv:DG/0511013.
- [36] V. Apostolov, P. Gauduchon, G. Grantcharov, “Bihermitian structures on complex surfaces”, Proc. London Math. Soc. **79** (1999) 414 Corrigendum: **92** (2006) 200.
- [37] Y. Lin and S. Tolman, “Symmetries in generalized Kähler geometry”, arXiv:math.DG/0509069.
- [38] Y. Lin and S. Tolman, “Reduction of twisted generalized Kähler structure”, arXiv:math.DG/0510010.
- [39] Y. Lin, ”Generalized geometry, equivariant  $\bar{\partial}\partial$  lemma, and torus actions”, arXiv:math.DG/0607401.
- [40] Y. Lin, “The equivariant cohomology theory of twsited generalized complex manifolds”, arXiv:0704.2804 [math.DG].
- [41] M. Stiénon and P. Xu, “Poisson–quasi–Nijenhuis manifolds”, arXiv:math.DG/0602288.

- [42] A. S. Cattaneo and G. Felder, “A path integral approach to the Kontsevich quantization formula”, Commun. Math. Phys. **212** (2000) 591 [arXiv:math.qa/9902090].
- [43] A. S. Cattaneo and G. Felder, “On the AKSZ formulation of the Poisson sigma model”, Lett. Math. Phys. **56** (2001) 163 [arXiv:math.qa/0102108].
- [44] N. Ikeda, “Two-dimensional gravity and nonlinear gauge theory”, Annals Phys. **235** (1994) 435, [arXiv:hep-th/9312059].
- [45] P. Schaller and T. Strobl, “Poisson structure induced (topological) field theories”, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **9** (1994) 3129 [arXiv:hep-th/9405110].
- [46] S. Cordes, G. W. Moore and S. Ramgoolam, “Lectures On 2-D Yang-Mills Theory, Equivariant Cohomology And Topological Field Theories”, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **41** (1995) 184 [arXiv:hep-th/9411210].
- [47] N. Ikeda, “Three Dimensional Topological Field Theory induced from Generalized Complex Structure”, arXiv:hep-th/0412140.
- [48] N. Ikeda and T. Tokunaga, “An Alternative Topological Field Theory of Generalized Complex Geometry”, arXiv:0704.1015 [hep-th].
- [49] J. E. Marsden and T. S. Ratiu, “Reduction of Poisson manifolds”, Lett. in Math. Phys. **11** (1986) 161.
- [50] J.-P. Ortega, and T. S. Ratiu, “Singular reduction of Poisson manifolds”, Lett. in Math. Phys. **46** (1998) 359.
- [51] F. Magri and C. Morosi, “On the reduction theory of the Nijenhuis operators and its applications to Gel’fand-Dikiĭ equations”, Proceedings of the IUTAM-ISIMM symposium on modern developments in analytical mechanics, Vol. II (Torino, 1982) **117** (1983) 599.